## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

VS.

Criminal No. 24-257

MOHAMAD HAMAD,

Defendant.

Transcript of proceedings on May 1, 2025 United States District Court, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, before Judge Patricia Dodge.

## APPEARANCES:

For the Government: U.S. Attorney's Office

Nicole Vasquez Schmitt, Esquire

700 Grant Street

Suite 4000

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

For the Defendant: Federal Public Defender

Andrew Lipson, Esquire Yemi Olaiya, Esquire 1500 Liberty Center 1001 Liberty Avenue

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222

Court Reporter: Barbara Metz Loch, RMR, CRR

700 Grant Street

Suite 6260

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(9:34 a.m.)

THE COURT: When we were last here, I believe that the government had concluded any evidence or testimony it wished to present; is that right?

MS. VASQUEZ SCHMITT: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And at this point, does the defendant choose to present any evidence or testimony, other than what has already been given?

MS. OLAIYA: None, Your Honor. We would move for the admission of the remainder of the exhibits, primarily, Your Honor, those being letters of support for Mr. Hamad, in addition to prior court-related orders in regards to this case and the transcripts of the preliminary hearing that happened in November that we submitted yesterday, that would be Exhibit P, and Exhibit N, being a figure in regards to release, so we would just ask for the remainder of those exhibits to be admitted.

THE COURT: Is there any objection?

MS. VASQUEZ SCHMITT: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right then. All of those exhibits are admitted, and that would be Exhibits A through P.

MS. OLAIYA: That's correct. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Then I believe at this point, we are prepared to proceed with argument, and I look forward to

hearing from counsel. So, Ms. Vasquez Schmitt, let's start with you.

MS. VASQUEZ SCHMITT: Thank you, Your Honor. This defendant, Mohamad Hamad, should be detained pretrial. The district court judge assigned to this case, Judge Wiegand, already held that he was a danger to the community and a flight risk when she denied the defendant's motion to remove his home detention. This was docket No. 79. I don't know if Your Honor has seen it, but I'm going to pass up a copy.

THE COURT: I have, but thank you.

MS. VASQUEZ SCHMITT: Your Honor, Judge Wiegand held, and I have some of the language highlighted there in that docket entry, that the defendant does present a risk of flight and danger to the community based on the evidence she had seen, which is some of the same evidence Your Honor heard on Tuesday, and Your Honor had the benefit of hearing even more.

Judge Wiegand continued the defendant's home detention, but at the time, there was no pending request for detention by the government. Judge Wiegand could not do any more, but this court can, Your Honor. This court can protect the community and assure the defendant's appearance at trial by detaining him.

Regarding flight, which the government must only prove by a preponderance of the evidence, this court saw the defendant has bragged about his ability to evade law

enforcement and sneak out. He also said explicitly that he wanted to travel overseas and fight. He gave inconsistent information during his background investigation about whether he had a Lebanese passport.

The FBI, as the testimony revealed, would only be able to tell if he traveled internationally on a passport, not whether one existed at all in the first place.

The defendant also has numerous foreign contacts which he also initially lied about during his background investigation. These facts establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the defendant is a flight risk.

The Bail Reform Act also refers to the risk that the defendant will obstruct justice or attempt to obstruct justice. Here, while on home detention, the defendant began attending Micaiah Collins' father's church in February of 2025 and attended it for approximately ten weeks.

The defendant is not Christian. He is Muslim. If he had been curious about Christianity, certainly he could have attended a church in his own neighborhood, but instead, he chose to go across town to the church where he had been seen on surveillance with the now codefendant Micaiah Collins and others who could be witnesses in this case.

The note on his phone from October 2024 suggest they may have been discussing blowing the FBI surveillance and dying standing while at that church.

We do not, Your Honor, as was apparent, have evidence of who attended the church with the defendant in the last few months. We just found out he was going there, but it's no great leap to conclude that Micaiah Collins was there. It's her father's church. The defendant knew what he did with Micaiah Collins. He knew she was referenced in the complaint. They were his messages, his conduct. Surely he knew who he detonated a device with that night.

Indeed, the defendant is now charged with conspiring with Micaiah Collins to build bombs. This is not someone he should have been meeting with while on home detention. The time frame of his attendance at the church also lines up exactly with when there were multiple posts, fliers and protests regarding witnesses resisting the grand jury in this case.

Interestingly, the defendant did not begin going to the church right after his arrest. It wasn't until February when the government was subpoenaing witnesses to the grand jury that he began his attendance at Micaiah Collins' father's church.

The upshot of all this is it can allow the court to conclude that the defendant may attempt to obstruct justice if he is allowed to remain on bond. He certainly did not tell his probation officer whose church it was or give him all the facts. This is par for the course for the defendant who

believes he can one-up law enforcement.

The defense will argue that he didn't technically violate a bond condition because that condition was struck. Probation Officer Orrison testified that, in 14 years, he had never seen that box unchecked that you can't have contact with witnesses and victims.

Defense did mark newly the transcript from that hearing and that transcript is telling. It shows that it was the added language forbidding the defendant from Jewish-owned or affiliated locations. That was the subject of the debate, Your Honor. There was no mention in that 100-plus page transcript about whether he could have contact with witnesses or victims. It was that added language that was the subject of the debate.

In any event, Your Honor, this court doesn't need to find a bond violation in order to detain the defendant. The point the government is trying to make is that there is evidence that this defendant, while on home detention, was attempting to obstruct or was in fact obstructing justice by meeting with potential witnesses.

Most importantly, Your Honor, regarding danger to the community, this defendant has shared violent militant pro Hamas, pro Hezbollah content, including from the October 7 Hamas attacks of multiple murdered individuals. When he shared these videos, he stated things like "Us Muslims never

surrender or back down" and "Lebanon just smoked they ass."

He shared a video of children being indoctrinated with Hamas propaganda. He threatened people online. He stated his desire for bullets to touch the foreheads of Zionists. He expressed a desire to fight and die as a martyr. He called himself a terrorist and a Hamas operative.

He bragged about stealing flags and terrorizing residents while dressed as a Hamas operative. He spray painted a Hamas target on to a Jewish institution. He manufactured and tested explosives, including pipe bombs and explosives with shrapnel.

Your Honor, we don't know definitively what his plans were for the explosives, but the messages with Collins and Lubit are extremely concerning. He and Lubit talked about an upcoming exercise on the defendant's military base, but then said don't talk about this over text, and he and Collins discussed blowing up people's ankles in concrete.

The FBI unfortunately did not recover the explosive materials in this case. They could be hidden in his home or elsewhere, which is a very dangerous situation.

Also, the defendant was screen shotting recipes for explosives on October 30, 2024, the day of his arrest, and there was a note on his phone stating that he wanted to die standing rather than face serious federal charges.

Your Honor, the government also has concerns about

the defendant being on an extended period of home detention with his family. As the court heard, there have been allegations of the defendant's violent, aggressive and threatening behavior to his family members. We all know there are many reasons why domestic disputes do not always lead to a conviction.

The police report states the defendant admitted to the altercation with his sister. The defendant threatened to shoot his sister, who was 13 at the time, in the face with a metal pellet that travels as fast as a bullet.

The report also states he pushed his mother, held a knife to his brother's throat in the past and was generally physically aggressive to his parents, but they didn't report him. His brother and sister said they were scared for their safety and the safety of their family members based on the defendant's conduct. His sister is still a minor, and she still resides at the residence.

And now he is home, not working, not attending school. If his behavior was escalating before, imagine the tension and anger the defendant will be feeling now if he's sent home. Federal cases can be long. An extended period of home detention here can put his family members at risk, and certainly, the government would oppose ever removing that condition.

Your Honor, this is a unique situation, where a

1.3

defendant was initially charged with some misdemeanors and now where the full nature of his conduct and dangerousness has later been uncovered by the government. It is a unique situation before the court. The court must assess the risk of flight and dangerousness based on the full record before it today.

Importantly, Your Honor, pretrial services is now recommending detention. They, out of everyone in this room, know best about how the defendant behaved on bond, and yet they are still recommending that he be detained today.

The stakes are so much higher for the defendant, now that he's charged with multiple felonies.

He may have thought he got away with a lot of his conduct and was just waiting out the misdemeanor charges, Your Honor, but now he has much more incentive to flee. Much more incentive to put his plans into action to harm the community.

For all of those reasons, Your Honor, the court should detain the defendant pretrial. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you very much. I'll hear now from Ms. Olaiya, please.

MS. OLAIYA: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, this case boils down to what the law says and what the facts are.

First, turning to some of the points that the government made during its argument. Number one, while Judge Wiegand decided to keep Mr. Hamad on home detention, the

assertion that she could not have done more is simply false. She could have, based on the government's assertion, requested a detention hearing and had Mr. Hamad detained if she felt that he was indeed a danger and that there were no conditions that could be placed on him.

Instead, what she did was decide to keep him on home detention, clearly signaling that there are conditions that can be put in place and she decided to have those conditions remain in place, which clearly show that there is a reasonable assurance for both his appearance as well as the safety of the community.

Secondly, Your Honor, attacking religion is wholly unconstitutional on the government's part. Where Mr. Hamad decides to practice his faith, who he decides to commune with under the First Amendment is protected. There is absolutely no evidence that Micaiah Collins or any other witnesses or potential witnesses in this case were ever present at that church.

Probation, Ben Orrison, did know about Mr. Hamad's whereabouts. Every single time he went to that church, he called Mr. Orrison to make sure that he was aware, to make sure that he had permission, and if there was any concern at all, at any point in time, probation could have raised it with the court, which they did not, clearly showing that there was no violation and that he did not meet with witnesses.

What further evidences this, Your Honor, is that if there was indeed an obstruction, the government could have indicted it, if they believe he had been meeting with witnesses or tainting, in some sort of way, evidence or potential witnesses, but they never did that.

To the contrary, Your Honor, the government then turned around and decided to indict a person who they wanted to use as a witness. Not to mention, Your Honor, just to make clear, the government is also asserting that Mr. Hamad was the one who spray painted a building, but their own theory of their case is that it was not Mr. Hamad. So to say that now is very disingenuous during this very contentious detention hearing.

Every alleged offense, Your Honor, took place before Mr. Hamad was ever indicted. The government asserts that, had it known this information at the time of the indictment, it would not have agreed to release, yet the government's own witness on cross-examination could not provide a definitive answer as to when these alleged aggravating factors were finally discovered.

So we are left with what the government had and when they had it. The first search of Mr. Hamad's home took place in August of last year, August 2024. This is when the government seized the phone that had the most concerning information presented in this case, including alleged

incendiary devices and Mr. Hamad allegedly detonated them.

Then in November, as shown by Exhibit M, the government had information from Mr. Hamad's Instagram account as presented to the defense during discovery.

The fact remains that the government cannot say it just learned about this alleged information a week ago, two weeks ago or even 30 days ago. To the contrary, in November of 2024, in Exhibit B, this is on page 37 of the transcript, Your Honor, from the preliminary hearing, lines 12 through 613, AUSA Carolyn Bloch asked Agent Brian Collins:

On July 7, Mr. Hamad and that individual continued to have conversations. Did the other individual send Mr. Hamad a video of them undertaking the explosion of this test run?

Yes, the text is I keep watching the video, and then individual number one sent Mr. Hamad a video clip.

This clearly shows, Your Honor, that the government had this information and was aware of it, of the most serious offenses that they are alleging today.

This is part of the very foundation of the government's argument about why they are now seeking detention. This then means that what is true is that the government had this information in their possession for almost half a year while Mr. Hamad was on pretrial release.

Here are more facts. We are in a unique situation because, as the government mentioned, rarely does the court or

any of us have an opportunity to test whether there are indeed any conditions of release that can be put in place that would reasonably assure the person's appearance and the safety of the community. Yet we are in that exact situation today.

Mr. Hamad has been fully successful on pretrial release. There have been no violations of pretrial release, as testified to by Ben Orrison who was directly supervising Mr. Hamad. There is no harm he has caused to anyone while on release. There have been two court ordered appearances since Mr. Hamad's arrest while he was on release which he fully complied with, Exhibit G being the warrant this honorable court signed for Mr. Hamad's prints and DNA in February.

What some would feel is a complete violation of their person, their bodily autonomy and in response to that, might defy a court order, Mr. Hamad did what this court ordered him to do. He came to this very courthouse and fully complied in giving both his DNA and fingerprints to the government.

Mr. Hamad has consistently done what has been required of him.

And while the law only requires reasonable assurance and not a guarantee regarding conditions of release,

Mr. Hamad's behavior on pretrial release unequivocally shows that conditions do exist that assure both his appearance and community safety.

Now, Exhibit G, the original bond report in this case, states that Mr. Hamad can be released on conditions. It

also included the offense from 2022 that the government is trying to use against Mr. Hamad and besmirch his character. The simple truth is the charges were dismissed and cannot be held against Mr. Hamad for that very reason.

His family is here willing and ready and happily and painstakingly supporting him and wanting to see his release.

Ben Orrison, probation officer who is directly supervising

Mr. Hamad, went to his house several times, spoke with his parents, met his little sister. At any point in time if they had any concern about Mr. Hamad being there, they could have expressed it, and they did not.

To the contrary, they wanted him back home, and they are here today showing their presence, stating that they want him home again.

Now, turning to Mr. Hamad himself, his character, his physical and mental condition. After this case, Mr. Hamad unfortunately developed issues with his health. These issues are ongoing and they are unknown at this time because further testing is necessary. Right before his arrest, Mr. Hamad did have an appointment for the following day which obviously he wasn't able to attend, but he's hoping, with these appointments, to get an official diagnosis for the care he will need.

As we know, the jail is probably unlikely to be equipped to determine a diagnosis for Mr. Hamad, let alone

care for it over a period of time.

The family ties that Mr. Hamad has, again, are very strong. They're here. They want to help him through this incredibly difficult time and see him through this process successfully. Mr. Hamad lacks financial resources due to his inability to work right now because of a lack of transportation.

Where he's currently living is not like he can hop on a bus or catch a ride or anything of that nature. He does not have a license right now, and so he is, for all intents and purposes, confined primarily just to his home.

Additionally, Your Honor, he also does not have his U.S. passport. The only passport that has indeed been issued to him has been turned over to the United States Probation, so the risk of flight is completely mitigated, Your Honor, in this case.

Mr. Hamad, he has lived and was raised in the greater Pittsburgh community. He has very strong community ties, as evidenced by the moving letters of support. He has the full courtroom here backing him, Your Honor, for every court date he had. He has people here who love him, who care about him, of all faiths, Muslim, Jewish, Christian, atheist, who all want to see him succeed on pretrial release and put forth to the court that, whatever they can do to augment that, they will.

All that has changed, Your Honor, is that the government has finally decided to put forth information that it has been sitting on and has had in its possession since the beginning of last November, at the very latest.

What has happened since then? All of November passed, and there's no new detention request. All of December passed. No request for detention. All of January passed. No request for detention.

February comes along. Still no request for detention, but again, Mr. Hamad comes to court, gives his DNA and prints, complying with the court order, and frankly if Mr. Hamad was the person that the government is trying to paint him out to be, he could have fled then. If he had the capability to cause harm, he would have done so then, but he didn't because that is not his character, that is not who he is, and that is not who the government is trying to make him out to be.

All of March passes, Your Honor. Again, still no request for detention.

As it relates to the current bond report, Your Honor, Ben Orrison did not write that bond report. He didn't participate in any of the interviews. To the contrary, Your Honor, all bond reports go through, as this court knows, the supervisory channel before it is presented to the court, and as discussed in the report, all of their assessments are based

off of what the government is alleging. Not who Mr. Hamad is as a person. Not because he has failed during pretrial release.

He has been completely successful, as testified to by the government's own witness. Unfortunately, probation simply does not take that into account and only goes off of the offenses that the government is alleging.

Finally, Your Honor, what we have here at the end of April, and that the government is now seeking detention, but the strongest and immutable fact is that Mohamad has been on pretrial release for half a year and has been fully compliant with his conditions of release and none of this alleged information occurred while -- before he was indicted.

He has family and friends from this community who love him dearly and want to see him through this process and continue to help him be successful on pretrial release. To detain him now would be nothing short of punitive and in utter misalignment with the law. Thank you.

THE COURT: Let me ask you a couple of questions. With respect to the issue of transportation, I've heard what you've said. Do you know how he has been transported back and forth when he has attended religious services?

MS. OLAIYA: It's been primarily his father, Your Honor, who also transports him to court.

THE COURT: You mentioned health issues. I don't

want to pry into anything that's confidential or not yet diagnosed, but I didn't hear any evidence about health issues.

Do you want to speak further of that? And if it's private, I understand.

MS. OLAIYA: I can attest to Your Honor that Ben Orrison did mention on the stand that Mr. Hamad has talked to him about his ongoing health issues. If the court would like more details, we can happily approach sidebar.

THE COURT: That's all right. I don't.

With respect to the issue of the passport, and again, to the extent that you can discuss this with me, there's been conflicting evidence about whether Mr. Hamad has another passport. Do you have any information that you feel you can share with me on that subject?

MS. OLAIYA: Just that absolutely he does not. He does not. I can't, unfortunately, present the negative, but he does not have a Lebanese passport. Only a U.S. passport.

MR. LIPSON: One moment, Your Honor.

MS. VASQUEZ SCHMITT: Your Honor, I would object to her -- if she is going to offer a proffer on a fact, I would ask that her client be offered for cross-examination or some other witness be offered for cross-examination on that proffer.

THE COURT: Again, we are beyond the hearing point.

My question was only you indicated that he did not have it,

and I've not heard any evidence one way or the other. I think the evidence was that he had stated that he had one and then later said that he didn't. Is that your understanding of the testimony here?

MS. OLAIYA: Yes. He conferred with his father, based on the testimony, who handles the passports and was able to confirm he did not have one. Based on cross-examination, asking the FBI agent whether or not he could determine if there were any foreign documents, I believe he stated, that a person uses to travel, he confirmed that he did look into that and that there was nothing in regards to Mr. Hamad had ever done traveling with foreign documents aside from a U.S. passport.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Further argument, Ms. Vasquez Schmitt?

MS. VASQUEZ SCHMITT: Your Honor, just to the point about Micaiah Collins, just briefly. Probation Officer Orrison testified he didn't know about the connection to the church. That's why he was approving those visits, and he testified that if he -- if there was a possibility of the defendant meeting with potential witnesses, he would have had to dig into that much more, talk to the government, et cetera, and that didn't happen in this case.

I want to thank Attorney Olaiya for pointing out I should have said he conspired to spray paint a target for

destruction on a Jewish religious real property and surveilled that institution wearing Hamas gear.

With respect to the timing of the government's knowledge, Your Honor, it's really no surprise they're focusing on this because the evidence is so strong related to danger of the community and flight risk. They want to dig into exactly what date the government knew what.

I think the testimony was Instagram came in in November, but then Special Agent Battaglia explained there were some technical difficulties and then a human being has to lay eyes on things. When there are terabytes of data, some things can get missed.

I want to be clear that it's not that we knew everything that was presented to the court in November, and that's not what the evidence showed.

Your Honor, there's nothing improper about seeking detention now that he is facing multiple felonies and now that we have this new information.

Respectfully, the timing of when we knew it honestly doesn't matter. The court needs to assess the facts sitting here today.

With respect to -- Your Honor already discussed, there's no evidence in the record about health issues. You know, suddenly he needs to schedule appointments. He's had all these months to schedule appointments, and suddenly he

needs to do that now.

Honestly, probation considers much more than allegations in the indictment. Actually, usually in bond reports, they say we don't consider the nature and circumstances of the offense and the weight of the evidence. In fact, they consider all of the defendant's characteristics, and that's in fact what they focus on, not necessarily just the government's allegations, and they are recommending detention today, their office, even though Mr. Orrison wasn't directly involved in that recommendation.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Olaiya, anything further?

MS. OLAIYA: One moment, Your Honor. I'm sorry. If I could.

(Brief pause.)

MS. OLAIYA: Just putting a stipulation, Your Honor, that I failed to put in at the beginning of this hearing. My apologies. There were several paragraphs that, yesterday, both the government and the defense agreed came from the phone that was seized from Mr. Hamad's residence on -- in August of 2024 and just noting it for the record. It's paragraph 47.

THE COURT: Of what document?

MS. OLAIYA: I'm sorry, Your Honor. The superseding indictment.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. OLAIYA: 47, Your Honor, being the stipulation that it came from Instagram, and then paragraph 60, paragraph 65 and paragraph 67, those ones coming from the phone, Your Honor.

MS. VASQUEZ SCHMITT: Your Honor, we don't have a problem stipulating to that. We discussed with counsel if they would also stipulate that we didn't know about any of those paragraphs at the time of his initial arrest on October 30, 2024.

THE COURT: All right. Anything further, counsel?

MS. OLAIYA: Just confirming, Your Honor, that it's

60, 65, 67 and 70 from the phone and as the government pointed out 47 from the Instagram.

THE COURT: Thank you. At this point, I'm going to turn to my findings and conclusions in connection with the government's request for detention. As indicated throughout this process, the government has requested detention and requested to detain Mr. Hamad pending the trial in this matter on several bases.

First, that he represents a danger to others in the community and that he is a flight risk. Also it was argued today and in the request for detention that there is a risk that Mr. Hamad will obstruct or attempt to obstruct justice, and certainly that's why we are here today.

I will also note that we are here on a superseding

indictment that was issued by the grand jury in April of this year. That includes nine counts, some of which were alleged in the previous indictment, some of which were not, so we are addressing those nine counts here today.

As the parties know, I'm required to consider the four specific factors in the Bail Reform Act in order to make a determination about detention, and I'm going to go through those now.

And I will review some of the testimony and evidence, not all of it, but I have considered all of it, including all of the exhibits introduced by both the government and Mr. Hamad as well as the testimony of Officer Orrison and FBI Agent Battaglia.

The first of those factors that I must consider is the nature and circumstances of the alleged offenses. And in summary fashion, I'm going to review some of the evidence with respect to the nature and circumstances. We know, for example, that at some point in time, Mr. Hamad determined that he wanted to become a member of the Pennsylvania Air National Guard.

According to the indictment, he presented false information to the government during interviews regarding his ultimate allegiance to the United States. There is a fair amount of evidence that suggests that, in statements otherwise, he indicated that the country of Lebanon and

Palestine were number one in his consideration, that he joined the Air National Guard in order to learn combat skills.

At one point, referred to himself as a Hamas terrorist. Shared pro Hamas videos, content and propaganda, and at one point stated, "Let America kiss my ass."

Therefore, I view those to be serious allegations regarding dishonesty to the government about his allegiance to the United States.

We also know that, with respect to the nature and circumstances, Mr. Hamad allegedly was part of a conspiracy to deface Jewish religious property, and in one such instance, a spray paint of -- an inverted triangle was spray painted at the Chabad. That, at least according to the testimony I heard, represents that location would be a target.

We also know, based upon the allegations in the indictment, that at various points, Mr. Hamad manufactured and detonated explosives. The current location of anything he may have ordered under a pseudonym are not known at this time.

We also know that he at least stated that he was stealing Israeli flags and that he understood that might create terror if individuals at the homes where that was located would create terror if they saw how he was dressed.

He has also referred to himself as a Hamas operative and indicated that Jews are the enemy.

So I certainly view the circumstances and the nature

of the offenses with which Mr. Hamad has been charged, understanding he's entitled to the presumption of innocence, are serious.

In terms of the weight of the evidence, certainly we know that a federal grand jury has returned an indictment which reflects that the grand jury viewed that there was probable cause to indict Mr. Hamad on the nine counts with which he has been charged, and I view otherwise the weight here to be strong based upon the testimony of FBI Agent Battaglia regarding the investigation that was conducted in connection with the charges against him, and I'll get back to some of the timing of that at a later point.

With respect to the history and characteristics, which is the third factor I'm required to consider, I'm basing that, in part, on testimony provided during the hearing, in part, on the pretrial services report and other evidence that was submitted, and let me summarize what some of that evidence revealed.

Mr. Hamad does have ties to this area. He was born in Ohio. He resides with his parents and his minor sister in Coraopolis, Pennsylvania. He is unemployed, single and does not — it does not appear that he has had any employment other than his time with the Air National Guard, which apparently has been suspended based upon the investigation in terms of some of his actions and statements.

He is a dual citizen of the United States and Lebanon. He may or may not have a Lebanese passport. I'm not basing any of my findings specifically on that, because I don't think we have any evidence to the effect that he does have one. He does have ties both here to the United States and to Lebanon.

In terms of other history and characteristics, he indicated at one point that he wanted to join the Air National Guard in order to learn combat skills. He has described himself as a Hamas operative and a terrorist. He has stated at various times that he does not want to live here, that he wants to die fighting, that he doesn't see himself living long. His ultimate goal is shahid, in other words martyrdom, and he wants to go to Palestine.

He's also testified that he endorses at least the statement that bullets should touch the foreheads of Zionists.

He has, at various points, bragged about his ability -- I'm sorry, at one point bragged about his ability to evade law enforcement and suggested he would delete his chats in order to keep that information from the Air National Guard.

He has manufactured and tested explosives, and while professing that he wants to engage in the fight overseas, he has not confined his actions to going to Palestine. He has in fact been charged at least with defacing Jewish religious

property, stole Israeli flags and, as I mentioned previously, manufactured explosives and detonated explosives in this country for a purpose, at least at this point, unknown.

I certainly acknowledge and agree that he has complied with the conditions of his pretrial release. There's no evidence otherwise. He has attended the Valley View Presbyterian Church since February at least ten times. Certainly it is well within his prerogative to do so, as he has the right to exercise his religion.

I will note, however, that despite not being able to get transportation to seek any employment, he has been able to be transported all ten times, apparently, to that church, and I will note that the father of one of his codefendants is the pastor at that church.

Again, that does not mean that he cannot attend that church, but I do find the timing of beginning to attend that in conjunction with the request to modify his conditions of release to be interesting.

He does not have an extensive criminal history. I have reviewed the police report that was submitted as Exhibit 1 by the government. Obviously, there were no charges assessed there. There is some concern in my mind about threats of violence, but there has been, as indicated, no conviction with respect to that.

I am also concerned about the testimony of FBI agent

Battaglia about Mr. Hamad's conduct when he was arrested on the most recent indictment. In other words, refusing to come downstairs for some point and engaging in language that would not be appropriate, in my view, under the circumstances.

So I have considered all of that. I've also considered what the -- what Mr. Hamad has submitted as character references, and I have reviewed all of those, and certainly, there is no question that he has the support of friends and colleagues who remain willing to assist him, and certainly I appreciate their communications to me about that and have taken that into consideration.

I've also considered the entire pretrial services report, including its recommendation that Mr. Hamad should be detained. I've also reviewed, prior to today, both the motion to amend his conditions of pretrial release as well as the government's response to that, as well as Judge Wiegand's conclusion that Mr. Hamad does represent a danger to the community and a flight risk.

I do feel that the stakes are higher now, as

Ms. Vasquez Schmitt indicated, than they were when Mr. Hamad

was placed on conditions of release previously, given the

nature of the offenses with which he has now been charged. I

do note that many of the facts that I've heard here today were

presented in a prior proceeding and are not new.

I did hear, based upon the testimony of Agent

Battaglia, that there were a number of things that the FBI did not know when Mr. Hamad was arrested in October of 2024. That includes the Instagram videos, some of which we've seen here today that reflect violent conduct, the explosion of pipe bombs in State College or near State College, the fact that Mr. Hamad was looking for instructions about how to build explosive devices, contents of the police report from Moon Township that Mr. Hamad wanted to travel to Palestine and the possibility, and I'm saying just the possibility, of a Lebanese passport, again not saying there was one, I don't think there's any evidence to that effect, but Agent Battaglia also testified about knowledge of Lebanese friends and family which would not be unusual, given Mr. Hamad's dual citizenship.

I have also considered the nature and seriousness of danger to others in the community. I certainly don't doubt that Mr. Hamad, as far as all of us know, has complied with the conditions of his pretrial release. Nonetheless, I am also concerned about some of the addition evidence I've heard, plus the existence of a number of other charges in the indictment.

Walking through the risk of flight, I note that, as I mentioned earlier, there appears to me to be more incentive now to flee based upon additional charges, and Mr. Hamad, at one point at least, has bragged about his ability to evade law

enforcement, and certainly we know that, with that heightened incentive, there may be a further incentive to avoid the charges here.

With respect to the government's allegation to obstruct justice, all I'll note about that is that I do find it interesting that, while Mr. Hamad may certainly observe any religion freely that he chooses to do or no religion at all, the fact that he has, since February, been attending a church at which his codefendant's father is the pastor, I find to be somewhat interesting, and of course, we know that Defendant Collins was part of what is alleged to be a conspiracy to build explosive devices, and in fact, certain of those were detonated, whether that was with Ms. Collins or not.

And I also note that there has been some evidence presented about what has occurred just before Mr. Hamad's indictment with respect to grand jury resistance and subpoenas.

I've also examined the danger to the community. I observed Judge Wiegand's statements. I've reviewed all of the evidence here today, and despite the fact that Mr. Hamad has reflected, as far as I know, compliance with the conditions of pretrial release, I do find, by clear and convincing evidence, that there are no conditions or combination of conditions that will reasonably assure the safety of others based upon Mr. Hamad's actions, Mr. Hamad's statements, Mr. Hamad's

professed allegiance to Hamas, terroristic activities and engaging in conduct that seems to suggest that that will continue if he is released on conditions.

I'll note that being on home detention simply means that. In the event someone does not comply with those terms, eventually that will be known, but there is no instant notification that someone is evading the terms of their home detention.

So based upon all of those matters, the finding of Judge Wiegand and the testimony here about Mr. Hamad's professed allegiances and conduct, I am finding, by clear and convincing evidence, that there are no conditions that will reasonably assure the others based upon the new charges.

With respect to risk of flight, I'm not finding there is a significant risk of flight here, simply because I don't have enough evidence to suggest that Mr. Hamad has the resources or the ability to flee, even though I will note that there is likely to be a heightened urgency about his current status based upon the addition of new charges.

I will issue an order to that effect after this proceeding here today.

Ms. Vasquez Schmitt, is there anything further that you wanted to address?

MS. VASQUEZ SCHMITT: No. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Olaiya, Mr. Lipson, anything further?